

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 INGE T. ANDERSON,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 SCOTT ALAN ANDERSON,

12 Defendant.
13

NO. C17-0891RSL

ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS TO
QUASH SUBPOENAS

14 This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Motion to Quash Subpoena for Wells
15 Fargo Bank" (Dkt. # 74) and "Motion to Quash Subpoena for Scott Alan Anderson" (Dkt. # 75).
16 Plaintiff seeks discovery of defendant's bank account and earnings statements from 2011 to the
17 present, any applications he made for family separation pay, and all evidence of payments for
18 attorney's fees or retainers. Defendant opposed the discovery. Plaintiff's untimely response
19 memorandum has been considered in ruling on the motions.
20

21 The motions to quash are GRANTED in part. As a general matter, defendant's income
22 and wealth are irrelevant to plaintiff's claim for support under a form I-864 contract. If plaintiff
23 is entitled to support under the contract, the amount will be calculated as a percentage of the
24 poverty level, not of the sponsor's income or assets. The fact that plaintiff has repeatedly
25 asserted an interest in defendant's finances and expenditures does not make that information
26

27 ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS
28 TO QUASH SUBPOENAS - 1

1 relevant to any claim or defense asserted in this litigation. Nor has plaintiff made any effort to
2 explain how benefits applications or attorney's fee payments are relevant.

3 Defendant has, however, asserted affirmative defenses and counterclaims that put at issue
4 payments he made to plaintiff from the time of their separation to the present. If defendant
5 intends to argue that the calculation of the support he owes plaintiff under the I-864 contract
6 must be reduced by amounts he has already transferred to plaintiff, he shall, within fourteen days
7 of the date of this Order, produce any responsive bank account statements that reflect such
8 transfers. If defendant abandons the affirmative defenses and counterclaims that put the
9 payments at issue, no further production is necessary.
10
11

12
13 For all of the foregoing reasons, the motion to quash the subpoena served on Wells Fargo
14 (Dkt. # 74) is GRANTED. Defendant's second motion to quash (Dkt. # 75) is GRANTED in
15 part.
16

17 Dated this 14th day of March, 2019.

18 

19 Robert S. Lasnik
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27